Agenda for the *2005 Energy Report* Committee Workshop on the Proposal to Assess Electricity Supply and Bulk Transmission Planning and Related Data Needs for the *2005 Integrated Energy Policy Report*

Thursday, November 18, 2004

Welcoming Remarks
Commissioners John L. Geesman and James D. Boyd
2005 Integrated Energy Policy Report (*Energy Report*) Committee

Overview of 2005 Energy Report framework
Kevin Kennedy, *Energy Report* Program Manager

Integration of *2005 Energy Report* with 2006 CPUC procurement and ISO planning
Mike Jaske, Strategic Issues Integration (on integration issues)
Judy Grau, Engineering Office (on strategic transmission planning)
Paul Clanon, California Public Utilities Commission, Director, Energy Division
Jim Detmers, California Independent System Operator, Vice President, Operations

Comment and discussion

Lunch (timing of lunch break will depend on flow of discussion)

Electricity supply proposed analyses and data needs
David Vidaver, Electricity Analysis Office (on electricity supply data needs)
Mark Hesters, Engineering Office (on transmission system data needs)

Comment and discussion

Questions for workshop participants may want to address are provided on the following pages.

Questions for Workshop Participants

November 18, 2004
Workshop on the Proposal to Assess Electricity Supply and Bulk Transmission Planning and Related Data Needs for the 2005 Integrated Energy Policy Report

LSE-Based Assessments

1. In the 'Adequacy of LSE Planning' subsection of the staff paper (pp. 3-4), staff expresses concern that LSEs may not be planning to acquire adequate resources to cover load. Is this a reasonable description? If so, how should this be addressed in the *Energy Report* proceeding?

2. In the 'Resource Plans' subsection (p. 12), staff suggests that the 15-17% summer peak planning reserve margin adopted by the CPUC in D.04-01-050 is the right benchmark for all LSEs. Should the CPUC capacity benchmark be used as the basis for judging resource adequacy for those LSEs outside of the CPUC's jurisdiction?

3. In the 'Adequacy LSE Planning' subsection (p. 3), staff suggests that requiring these LSE-based resource plans is a way to identify what municipals and other LSEs are doing to implement the "loading order" policy preferences expressed by the state agencies and endorsed in the 2003 Energy Report. Are there any other means to determine what LSEs are doing?

Coordination Among Agencies in Planning

4. In the 'Resource Assessment Section' (pp. 8-10), staff proposes three stages to the analyses. Do these deliver products to the CPUC consistent with President Peevey's Sept. 16 Assigned Commissioner Ruling (ACR)? Which ones, if any, propose analyses that go beyond what is addressed in that ACR?

5. In these three stages of analyses, how are products developed that respond to the ISO's needs for more disaggregated load forecasts as a step toward more closely coupling long-term statewide planning with the CA ISO's annual grid planning process?

Transmission Planning

6. In the 'Summary of Assessment' section (pp. 3-4), staff proposes adequacy of LSE planning and strategic transmission planning as focuses for effort. How can this be done to advance the goal of integration between traditionally separate domains of resource planning and transmission planning?

Questions for Workshop Participants

7. How should the requirements of PRC 25324 (SB 1565, Bowen, Chapter 692 of 2004) to create a strategic transmission planning process be made compatible with the CA ISO's existing annual grid planning process?

8. How should PRC 25324, which addresses all transmission in California, and thus the control areas of LADWP, SMUD, and IID, interface with the CPUC's focus on linkages to the CA ISO?

Uncertainty

9. Staff proposes to shift to a much more explicit framework for understanding uncertainty and the range of need as the key quantitative deliverable to the CPUC. Given the difficulties of pursuing this in the past, is this realistic? How should it be accomplished?

10. Staff proposes (p. 13) that the scope of uncertainty analyses be postponed until a separate workshop and the requirements for LSEs be established following that workshop. How can these topics best be addressed while allowing adequate time for LSE response and consideration of the filings in the *Energy Report* proceeding?

11. Assuming LSEs submit uncertainty impact assessments according to staff's proposal, how should the Committee address differences among LSEs or between one LSE and the staff? Should differences of opinion about alternative futures and their impact on key metrics also be part of uncertainty assessments?

Data Collection Proposal

12. The staff paper includes some discussion of the data implications of staff's analytic proposal, e.g. requiring each LSE to provide a complete resource plan. How much time will LSEs likely need to respond the detailed data requests?

13. What are the principal challenges with acquiring the general types of data that are implied by the staff's proposal (pp. 11-17).

14. What portions of the LSE resource plans that staff proposes LSE should file should be considered confidential? Why?